UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/720,689	03/02/2001	Yoshifumi Yanagawa	2000-1779 A	5332

513	7590	06/09/2006

WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.
2033 K STREET N. W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021

EXAMINER
USTARIS, JOSEPH G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 March 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *42-82* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *42-82* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *7/15/2005*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This action is in response to the amendment dated 23 March 2006 in application

09/720,689. Claims 42-82 are pending. Claims 42, 44, 63, 72, and 80 are amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 42, 49-59, 63, 65, 66, 69-72, 74-78, 80, and 82 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teece (US005537605A) in view of May

(US006021492A).

Regarding claim 42, Teece discloses a system for controlling at least one piece

of equipment via a control unit. The system is a "network control system in an AVC

system to which a plurality of AV apparatuses are connected via a transmission line"

(See Fig. 1; column 3 line 66 – column 4 line 2). The system comprises a "controller

equipped with a user interface" (See Fig. 1, Control Unit) and a "device to be controlled"

(See Fig. 1, Nth Controllable Unit). The "device has in-device apparatus information and

version information indicative of a version of the in-device apparatus information" (See

Fig. 4, M, D, VN; column 2 lines 1-19, 40-54; column 6 lines 36-53), wherein inherently

the VN or "version information" is updated when the "in-device apparatus information is

updated" (See column 10 lines 44-54, column 11 lines 53-62). Furthermore, the

"controller is operable to check the version information inside the device by reading the

in-device apparatus information and version information from the device" (See column 9

lines 15-47) and is able to "detect a change inside the device based on the read version

information" (See column 10 lines 40-64). When the control unit determines the menu is

invalid, the control unit sends a request for the new menu where the controllable unit will

"automatically sends updated version information, which is indicative of a version of

updated in-device apparatus information" (See Fig. 7 column 10 lines 40-64).

Alternatively, the controllable unit can directly send the correct or "updated" menu or

"automatically sends updated version information" (See column 11 lines 50-62).

Furthermore, Teece discloses that "every time a change in state in the device occurs,

the device is operable to automatically send the updated version information which is

indicative of the change in state in the device to the controller" (See col. 10 lines 15-40,

col. 11 lines 6-23, and col. 12 lines 15-20). The control unit "receives and reads the

updated version information so that the updated version information is instantly

displayed" (See Fig. 7 column 10 lines 40-64). However, Teece does not disclose that

the process of "checking the version information inside the device is exclusively

performed by the controller and is not performed by the device".

May discloses a system that controls, interrogates, and tracks remote computers

(See Fig. 2). The management information system (MIS) console (See Fig. 2, element

11) is able to verify software versions on remote computers. The MIS requests the

version information from the remote computer. The remote computer then sends the

version information to the MIS, where the MIS will verify/check the version information

(See Figs. 7a and 7b; column 7 line 41 – column8 line 16). The MIS console

"exclusively" checks the version information inside the remote computer, where the

remote computer does not perform the version check. Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

the control unit disclosed by Teece to perform checking/verifying the version information

inside the device exclusively instead of the controllable unit, in order to reduce the

processing load performed by each of the controllable units and requiring only one unit

(e.g. control unit) to perform the version checking process.

Regarding claim 49, "the in-device apparatus information of the device is

operation screen information which shows an operation screen of the device" (See

Teece column 2 lines 41-54). Furthermore, "the device has the operation screen

information of the device and the version information showing the version of the

operation screen information" (See Teece Fig. 4, M and VN; column 6 lines 36-53),

where it is updated as discussed in claim 1 above. The "controller reads the operation

screen information and the version information from the device" (See Teece column 9

lines 15-47) and is able to "detect a change of the operation screen of the device by the

version information" (See Teece column 11 lines 40-62).

Regarding claim 50, "the operation screen information comprises a plurality of

objects" (See Teece column 2 lines 41-61, menu and bar charts). The "controller issues

a notification request to the device for requesting notification on changes of the

operation screen information when the device operation screen information of the

device is displayed on a display screen" (See Teece column 10 lines 44-54, column 11

lines 53-62). The control unit "receives the version information as a primary response to

the notification request" (See Teece column 11 lines 55-57, lines 60-62) and "receives

updated version information as a secondary response to the notification request when

the operation screen information is changed in the device" (See Teece column 11 lines

55-60).

Regarding claim 51, "the secondary response from the device contains the

updated version information and updated object information" (See Fig. 4; column 11

lines 55-60).

Claim 52 contains the limitations of claim 50 (where in the controllable unit or

"device" performs the functions claimed in claim 16) and is analyzed as previously

discussed with respect to that claim.

Claim 53 contains the limitations of claim 50 (where in the control unit or

"controller" performs the functions claimed in claim 53) and is analyzed as previously

discussed with respect to that claim.

Regarding claim 54, "the plurality of object comprises invariable objects" (See

Teece column 2 lines 42-54), wherein the menus define the functions of the controllable

unit and are not "varied irrespective of the device state" and "variable objects" (See

Teece column 3 lines 55-61), wherein the bar charts are "varied in accordance with the

device state" to reflect the current operating parameters and conditions of the

controllable units (See Teece column 5 lines 30-38). The control unit "reads the objects

from the device, carries out caching to the invariable objects, and displays the objects

on the display screen" (See Teece Fig. 2, RAM 36; column 5 lines 23-38, column 9 lines 47-50).

Regarding claim 55, each of the objects, i.e. menus and bar charts, are defined by menu descriptors or "invariable data set" and operation/control.parameters or "variable data set" (See Teece column 5 lines 30-38, column 6 lines 36-53, and column 12 lines 15-20). The control unit "carries out caching to the objects belonging to the invariable data set" (See Teece Fig. 2, RAM 36; column 9 lines 47-65).

Claim 56 contains the limitations of claim 54 (where in the controllable unit or "device" performs the functions claimed in claim 56) and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim.

Claim 57 contains the limitations of claim 54 (where in the control unit or "controller" performs the functions claimed in claim 57) and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim.

Claim 58 contains the limitations of claim 49 (where in the controllable unit or "device" performs the functions claimed in claim 58) and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim. Furthermore, inherently "the change of the operation screen is indicated by the version information" (See Teece column 10 lines 44-54, column 11 lines 53-62).

Claim 59 contains the limitations of claim 49 (where in the control unit or "controller" performs the functions claimed in claim 59) and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim.

Regarding claim 63, Teece discloses a system for controlling at least one piece

of equipment via a control unit. The system is a "network control system in an AVC

system to which a plurality of AV apparatuses are connected via a transmission line"

(See Fig. 1; column 3 line 66 – column 4 line 2). The system comprises a "controller

equipped with a user interface" (See Fig. 1, Control Unit) and a "device to be controlled"

(See Fig. 1, Nth Controllable Unit). The "device has a function information table that

shows a device function and state" (See column 2 lines 1-19 and 41-61), wherein the

control structure definitions has "component elements constituting the function

information table, and element version information that shows a version of the

component elements of the function information table" (See Fig. 4, M, D, VN; column 2

lines 1-19, 40-54; column 6 lines 36-53). Furthermore, the control unit "is operable to

check an read the element version information" and "detects changes of information in

the function information table using the element version information when the controller

uses the information in the function information table of the device" (See column 10

lines 40-64, column 11 lines 53-62). When the control unit determines the definitions are

invalid, the control unit sends a request for the new definitions where the controllable

unit will "automatically send updated element version information, which is indicative of

a updated component elements" (See Fig. 7 column 10 lines 40-64). Alternatively, the

controllable unit can directly send the correct or "updated" definitions or "automatically

sends updated element version information" (See column 11 lines 50-62). Furthermore,

Teece discloses that "every time a change in state in the device occurs, the device is

operable to automatically send the updated version information which is indicative of the

change in state in the device to the controller" (See col. 10 lines 15-40, col. 11 lines 6-23, and col. 12 lines 15-20). The control unit "receives and reads the updated element version information so that the updated version information is instantly displayed" (See Fig. 7 column 10 lines 40-64). However, Teece does not disclose that the process of "checking the version information inside the device is exclusively performed by the controller and is not performed by the device".

May discloses a system that controls, interrogates, and tracks remote computers (See Fig. 2). The management information system (MIS) console (See Fig. 2, element 11) is able to verify software versions on remote computers. The MIS requests the version information from the remote computer. The remote computer then sends the version information to the MIS, where the MIS will verify/check the version information (See Figs. 7a and 7b; column 7 line 41 – column8 line 16). The MIS console "exclusively" checks the version information inside the remote computer, where the remote computer does not perform the version check. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the control unit disclosed by Teece to perform checking/verifying the version information inside the device exclusively instead of the controllable unit, in order to reduce the processing load performed by each of the controllable units and requiring only one unit (e.g. control unit) to perform the version checking process.

Regarding claim 65, the control structure definitions includes multiple menus or "plurality of components", wherein each menu has a version number or "element version information" (See Teece Fig. 4, M0, M1, M2, and VN). The control unit is able to "detect

changes of the information of the component information using the element version

information of the component when the controller uses the information in the

components of the device" (See Teece column 10 lines 44-54, column 11 lines 53-62),

wherein the menu descriptors and version numbers are within the control structure

definitions or "function information table".

Regarding claim 66, the "controller issues a notification request to the device for

requesting notification on changes" (See Teece column 10 lines 44-54, column 11 lines

53-62), wherein the request can be made to multiple controllable units or "within a

notification range" (See Teece column 7 line 62 – column 8 line 9), "when the controller

uses the information in the function table of the device" (See Teece column 10 lines 41-

64). The control unit receives "the element version information corresponding to the

notification range, as the primary response to the notification request" (See Teece

column 11 lines 55-57, lines 60-62) and "if the information within the notification range is

changed, the controller receives the updated element version information as the

secondary response to the notification request" (See Teece column 11 lines 58-60).

Regarding claim 69, the version numbers of the menus also serve as "function

table version information", wherein the version numbers are within the control structure

definitions or "function table information".

Regarding claim 70, "the components are menus" (See Teece column 2 lines 41-

54).

Regarding claim 71, "the components are display parts" (See Teece column 2

lines 55-61 and column 5 lines 23-38).

Regarding claim 72, Teece discloses a system for controlling at least one piece

of equipment via a control unit. The system is a "network control system in an AVC

system to which a plurality of AV apparatuses are connected via a transmission line"

(See Fig. 1; column 3 line 66 – column 4 line 2). The system comprises a "controller

equipped with a user interface" (See Fig. 1, Control Unit) and a "device to be controlled"

(See Fig. 1, Nth Controllable Unit). The controllable unit has "apparatus information

holding means for holding in-device apparatus information, said in-device apparatus

information containing apparatus configuration information which indicates device

configuration information and containing operation screen information which indicates a

function and condition of the device and for configuring an operation screen of the

device" (See Fig. 3, CSD 54; column 2 lines 1-19 and 41-61). The controllable unit

inherently has a "version information generation managing means" that "generates

version information indicative of a change" for the menu descriptors in order to ensure

that the control unit has a valid menu (See column 10 lines 44-54, column 11 lines 53-

62). The control unit sends a "notification request to the device for requesting

notification of change of the in-device apparatus information, and to check the version

information" (See column 10 lines 40-64). The controllable unit's "response to

notification request automatically sends changed version information so that the

changed version information is instantly displayed" (See Fig. 4 and 7; column 10 lines

40-64 and column 11 lines 50-62). Furthermore, Teece discloses that "every time a

change in state in the device occurs, the device is operable to automatically send the

updated version information which is indicative of the change in state in the device to

the controller" (See col. 10 lines 15-40, col. 11 lines 6-23, and col. 12 lines 15-20).

However, Teece does not disclose that the process of "checking the version information

inside the device is exclusively performed by the controller and is not performed by the

device".

May discloses a system that controls, interrogates, and tracks remote computers

(See Fig. 2). The management information system (MIS) console (See Fig. 2, element

11) is able to verify software versions on remote computers. The MIS requests the

version information from the remote computer. The remote computer then sends the

version information to the MIS, where the MIS will verify/check the version information

(See Figs. 7a and 7b; column 7 line 41 – column8 line 16). The MIS console

"exclusively" checks the version information inside the remote computer, where the

remote computer does not perform the version check. Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

the control unit disclosed by Teece to perform checking/verifying the version information

inside the device exclusively instead of the controllable unit, in order to reduce the

processing load performed by each of the controllable units and requiring only one unit

(e.g. control unit) to perform the version checking process.

Regarding claim 74, the "operation screen information" is made up of menus or

"table of contents information" and bar charts or items or "action state information that

indicate the device functions and state" (See column 2 lines 1-19 and 41-61). The

menus and bar charts or items are also "objects" which are identified by and ID number

or "identifiers" (See column 6 lines 36-54). The "objects" are menus or "function menu",

bar charts or "display part" or also known as "still picture data", and the menus can also

be in the form of text or "text data" (See column 9 lines 55-60).

Regarding claim 75, the control unit has a means for "storing and controlling the

apparatus information and version information in relation to each other when the

controller reads the apparatus information in the device and the version information"

(See Teece column 9 lines 48-50, column 10 lines 40-64, and column 11 lines 40-62).

Regarding claim 76, a "notification request issued from the controller contains

information of a notification range" (See Teece column 10 lines 44-54, column 11 lines

53-62, column 7 line 62 – column 8 line 9), wherein the "notification range" indicates the

range which the control unit "hopes to bring the information in agreement" with all the

controllable devices that was within the notification range. The control unit receives from

the controllable unit or "device" a "primary response that contains the version

information corresponding to the notification range" (See Teece column 11 lines 55-57,

lines 60-62; column 7 line 62 – column 8 line 9).

Regarding claim 77, the control unit receives a "secondary response from the

device to the notification request" (See Teece column 11 lines 58-60) and the control

unit is able to detect a change (See Teece column 10 lines 55-57). The control unit

sends a "second notification request to the device before the changed object is

requested" (See Teece column 10 lines 55-64).

Regarding claim 78, the control structure definitions contain "the operation

screen information that has a function menu set list" (See Teece Fig. 4, row MO), where

the "function menu set list contains function table version information" (See Teece Fig.

4, row MO, box VN). Furthermore, "each of the function menu lists has element version

information" (See Teece Fig. 4, row M1, row M2, box VN). Inherently the "function table

version information and the element version information" are generated by the "version

information generation managing means".

Claim 80 contains the limitations of claim 72 (wherein the controllable unit

performs the method) and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those

claims.

Regarding claim 82, the controllable unit sends a "primary response" (See Teece

column 11 lines 55-57, lines 60-62) and a "secondary response" (See Teece column 11

lines 58-60) to the control unit "in response to the notification request from the

controller". The control unit is able to judge "that the version information is changed, and

using an identifier of updated apparatus information contained in the secondary

response, reads the updated apparatus information and updates the version information

in the controller (See Teece Figs. 4 and 7; column 10 lines 40-64 and column 11 lines

40-62).

Claims 43-48, 61, 62, 64, 67-68, and 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Teece (US005537605A) in view of May (US006021492A).

Claim 43 contains the limitations of claim 1 and is analyzed as previously

discussed with respect to that claim. Furthermore, "the in-device apparatus information

of the device inside is state information showing a condition of the device" (See Teece

column 2 lines 55-61). The control unit is able to "read the state information" (See

Teece column 35-40). However, Teece in view of May does not disclose that the

operation/conditions parameters or "state information" have "version information that

shows the version of the state information".

Teece does disclose that menu descriptors have version numbers or "version

information" and further discloses that alternative data structures can be used (See Fig.

4; column 6 lines 36-61). Official Notice is taken that it is well known to apply version

information to any type of information/data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the

operation/conditions parameters as disclosed by Teece in view of May to have "version

information that shows the version of the state information", in order to provide a means

of distinguishing current operation/conditions parameters from previous

operation/conditions parameters. Furthermore, the "version information" is updated as

described in claim 1 above.

Claim 44 contains the limitations of claims 43 and 50 and is analyzed as

previously discussed with respect to those claims. Wherein, the verification process can

be performed when updating the bar chart on the display using the operation/conditions

parameters (See Teece column 10 lines 35-40 and column 11 line 63 – column 12 line

6).

Regarding claim 45, the control unit inherently reads the new

operation/conditions parameters or "state information" when it is received within the

"second response" as discussed in claim 50 above, which is after the first response as

discussed in claim 50 above or "the controller reads the state information between the primary response and the secondary response".

Claim 46 contains the limitations of claims 44 and 45 (where in the controllable unit or "device" performs the functions claimed in claim 46) and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 47 contains the limitations of claim 44and 45 (where in the control unit or "controller" performs the functions claimed in claim 47) and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 48 contains the limitations of claims 44 and 51 (wherein the secondary response would carry the new operation/conditions parameters or "updated state formation") and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 61 contains the limitations of claims 42 and 43 (where in the controllable unit or "device" performs the functions claimed in claim 61) and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 62 contains the limitations of claim 42 and 43 (where in the control unit or "controller" performs the functions claimed in claim 11) and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 64 contains the limitations of claim 63 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim. However, Teece in view of May does not disclose that the control structure definitions or "function information table" have "function table version information that indicates the version of the function table" and for the control

unit to "detect changes of the information in the function information table using the function table version information".

Teece does disclose that menu descriptors have version numbers or "version information" and further discloses that alternative data structures can be used (See Teece Fig. 4; column 6 lines 36-61). Furthermore, Teece discloses that the control unit uses the version number to validate the current menu (See Teece column 10 lines 44-54, column 11 lines 53-62). Official Notice is taken that it is well known to apply version information to any type of information/data and to use the version information to detect changes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the control structure definitions as disclosed by Teece in view of May to have a "function table version information that indicates the version of the function table" and for the control unit to "detect changes of the information in the function information table using the function table version information", in order to provide a means of distinguishing current control structure definitions from previous control structure definitions thereby providing the most up to date menus and control parameters for the control unit. Furthermore, the control unit is also able to "detect changes of information of the component elements using the element version information when the controller uses the information in the function information table of the device" as discussed in claim 22 above (See Teece Fig. 4; column 10 lines 44-54, column 11 lines 53-62).

Claim 67 contains the limitations of claims 45 and 66 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 68 contains the limitations of claims 48 and 66 (wherein the "secondary response would carry the "updated element version information" as well as the menu descriptors or "updated information" (See Teece Fig. 4)) and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Regarding claim 79, the controllable unit sends responses to the control unit from the control structure definitions (CSDs). The CSDs contain "version information that is included in the menu list response" (See Teece Fig. 4, row M0, box VN). However, Teece in view of May does not disclose that the "display part response" and the "object response" include "version information".

Teece does disclose that menu descriptors have version numbers or "version information" and further discloses that alternative data structures can be used (See Teece Fig. 4; column 6 lines 36-61). Official Notice is taken that it is well known to apply version information to any type of information/data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the operation/conditions parameters or "display part response" (See Teece column 2 lines 55-61) and the rotary control device (RDI) description or "object response" (See Teece Fig. 4, RDI) as disclosed by Teece in view of May to have "version information", in order to provide a means of distinguishing current parameters/descriptions from previous parameters/descriptions.

Claims 60, 73, and 81 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teece (US005537605A) in view of May (US006021492A) as applied to claims 42,

49-59, 63, 65, 66, 69-72, 74-78, 80, and 82 above, and further in view of Jerding et al.
(US006792616B1).

Claim 60 contains the limitations of claim 1 and is analyzed as previously
discussed with respect to that claim. However, Teece in view May does not disclose
that the "version information is a counter value which is incremented every time the
information of the device inside is updated".

Jerding et al. (Jerding) discloses a system for updating version numbers of
various tables. Jerding discloses that each time a table is updated, the table's version
number is incremented or "version information is a counter value which is incremented
every time the information of the device inside is updated" (See column 5 lines 48-67).
Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to modify the version number within the controllable unit disclosed
by Teece in view of May to be "a counter value which is incremented every time the
information of the device inside is updated", as taught by Jerding, in order to provide a
means of distinguishing the various versions from another and to also provide an easy
means of identifying the most recent version.

Claim 73 contains the limitations of claims 60 and 72 (where inherently the
controllable device has a "version information generation means" in order to
successfully provide the version number) and is analyzed as previously discussed with
respect to those claims.

Claim 81 contains the limitations of claims 60 and 80 and is analyzed as
previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 42-82 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues with respect to claims 42, 63, 72, and 80 that Teece does not

disclose that "every time a change in state in the device (controllable unit) occurs, the

device is operable to automatically send the updated version information which is

indicative of the change in state in the device to the controller". However, reading the

claims in the broadest sense, Teece does meet that limitation. Teece discloses that

every time a change in state in the device occurs (based on the user input operation),

the device is operable to automatically send the updated version information which is

indicative of the change in the state in the device to the controller (See col. 10 lines 15-

40, col. 11 lines 6-23, and col. 12 lines 15-20).

Applicant is reminded that although the claims are interpreted in light of the

specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re*

Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

4.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. .Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Joseph G. Ustaris whose telephone number is 571-272-

7383. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5PM; Alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Christopher S. Kelley can be reached on 571-272-7331. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JGU
June 2, 2006

CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600